

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

XD.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/080,874	02/22/2002	Brian Robert Walker	674543-2001.3	674543-2001.3 2506	
20999	7590 01/13/2005		EXAMINER		
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG			GUCKER, STEPHEN		
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1647		
•		-	DATE MAILED: 01/13/2009	5 .	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	ı No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/080,874		WALKER ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Stephen G	ucker	1647				
-	- The MAILING DATE of this communicate			correspondence address				
Period for	r Reply							
THE N - Extendafter S - If the position of the	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) date period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor is to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, the ply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no even ation. 9ys, a reply within the statutory period will apply and will by statute, cause the applic	t, however, may a reply be tin ory minimum of thirty (30) day expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ation to become ABANDONE	nely filed  s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n 09 September 20	104.					
,	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.							
,	•			osecution as to the merits is				
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
		<b>,</b>						
Disposition	on of Claims							
,—	Claim(s) <u>14</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>14</u> is/are rejected.							
· •	)☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	n and/or election red	quirement.					
Application	on Papers	·						
9) 🗀 7	The specification is objected to by the Ex	xaminer.						
/—	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		objected to by the	Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the							
_	The oath or declaration is objected to by							
/								
-	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for the claim for the control of the priority doc	cuments have been	received.		*			
	2. Certified copies of the priority doc				,			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the	•		ed in this National Stage				
* 0	application from the International	•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	od.				
3	ee the attached detailed Office action fo		sa copies not receive	zu.				
A440.ch	(a)							
Attachment	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4)  Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
′ <del>=</del>	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-		Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate				
3) Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO No(s)/Mail Date	_ 7. /_ 1 / 2 / 2 /	5)	Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/080,874

Art Unit: 1647

## Response to Amendment

- 1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 2. Any objections or rejections made in a previous Office Action that are not herein reinstated have been withdrawn.
- 3. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lakshmi et al. ("Lakshmi"). Lakshmi teaches measuring the reductase activity of 11-Beta HSD1 (called 11-OR activities in the reference) from brain micropunches. Lakshmi discloses that NADPH increased the specific reductase activity by 4-fold (pages 1743-1744), meeting the broad limitations of the claim of determining whether a compound or composition is a regulator of intracellular glucocorticoid activity.

Applicant's arguments filed 9/9/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant fails to point out any claim limitation that is not met by the prior art of record. A brain micropunch is not equivalent to a homogenate as Applicant alludes. A brain micropunch is similar to a tissue slice, and does indeed reflect the <u>in vivo</u> activity of the enzyme in question. Furthermore, Applicant concedes that the reference measured the bidirectionality of the enzyme, which clearly meets the broad limitations of the claim (which recites, but does not limit the claim to, measuring the enzymatic activity in one direction).

4. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gomez-Sanchez et al. ("Gomez-Sanchez"). Gomez-Sanchez teaches the administration of carbenoxolone (an inhibitor of 11-Beta HSD1 reductase activity, see abstract of Gomez-

Application/Control Number: 10/080,874

Art Unit: 1647

Sanchez) to rat brain via intracerebroventricular (i.c.v.) infusion (page E1126). Gomez-Sanchez meets the broad limitations of the claim because Gomez-Sanchez measures the blood pressure of the rat receiving the inhibitor of 11-Beta HSD1 reductase activity as a determinant as to whether or not the compound or composition is a regulator of glucocorticoid activity (abstract and Figures 1-3).

Applicant's arguments filed 9/9/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant fails to persuasively point out any claim limitation that is not met by the prior art of record. Applicant argues that a different isoenzyme may produce the blood pressure rise observed by the prior art, but this assertion does not rule out the participation of the enzyme in question in the instant claim, particularly when the process steps of the prior art are encompassed by the instant claim (due to the broadness of the claim). The Examiner was not supplied with a copy of reference #65 mentioned in the declaration, so the Examiner could not evaluate this reference in relation to Applicant's assertion.

- 5. No claim is allowed.
- 6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Application/Control Number: 10/080,874

Art Unit: 1647

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technical Center 1600 general number which is (571) 272-1600.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gucker whose telephone number is (571) 272-0883. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 0930 to 1800. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback, can be reached at (571) 272-0961. The fax phone number for this Group is currently (571) 273-8300.

Stephen Gucker

January 10, 2005

LORRAINE SPECTOR PRIMARY EXAMINER